

**Remarks/Arguments:**

Claims 1, 8-11 and 20-23 have been amended. No new matter is introduced herein. Claims 1-6 and 8-23 are pending.

Claims 9, 10, 21 and 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In particular, claims 9 and 21 recite the feature of a "program for making a computer execute." Claims 9 and 21 have been amended to recite a "program on a computer-readable medium, which program causes a computer to act." Claims 10 and 22 have been amended to recite a computer-readable recording medium. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 9, 10, 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 8, 11, 20 and 23 include advantages neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited art. As described on page 15, line 13 - page 14, line 4, in Figs. 1-3, a video recorder separates an AutoREC signal which is multiplexed with a recorded video signal. Then, the exemplary video recorder detects information on a start point and an end point of a cut that is generated in conjunction with the recording start operation and the stop operation of an image pick-up device (Figs. 1 and 2). Video recording means 33 (Fig. 3) divides the generated video signal according to AutoREC signal detection means 32 (Fig. 3), that continuously detects the recording marks in the AutoREC signal having a same value. In this manner, information on the start point and the end point of a cut is multiplexed beforehand with the recorded video signal and it is possible to detect a change between cuts and to record them as separate video files. Accordingly, the subject invention, as recited by claims 1, 8, 11, 20 and 23 includes features and advantages neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited art.

Claims 1-6 and 8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Shimada (U.S. Patent No. 5,592,301). It is respectfully submitted, however, that these claims are patentable over the cited art for the reasons set forth below.

Claim 1, as amended, includes features neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited art, namely:

... video signal recording means of recording said generated video signal ...

... wherein said video signal recording means records a video signal with which said generated AutoREC signal has been multiplexed ... (Emphasis Added)

Claim 8 includes a similar recitation. Basis for the amendment can be found, for example, at page 15, line 13 - page 16, line 4 and Figs. 1-3.

Shimada discloses, in Fig. 1, a video camera apparatus, including recording portion 6, system controller 7 for controlling signal processing circuit 4 and recording portion 6, recording switch 8 for activating/deactivating a recording operation and time set switch 9 for setting a predetermined shot time of one cut (col. 2, lines 25-45). System controller 7 controls character generator 11 to generate a display signal including a date, a time and a counted value of a tape counter. The display signal is added to luminance signal Y by adder 5. (Col. 2, line 65 - col. 3, line 3). The video camera apparatus also includes connecting switch 10 for actuating an auto stop-mode that automatically stops the recording operation when the actual recording time exceeds a cut time set by time-set button 9 (col. 2, lines 55-60).

Shimada does not disclose or suggest Applicants' claimed features of "video signal recording means of recording said generated video signal ... said video signal

recording means records a video signal with which said generated AutoREC signal has been multiplexed" (emphasis added). These features are neither disclosed nor suggested by Shimada. As shown in Fig. 1 and described at col. 3, lines 1-3, in Shimada, adder 5 embeds a date, a time and a counted value of a tape counter in a video signal to be recorded. As known to the skilled person, it is typically difficult to separate embedded information completely from a video signal. In contrast, in Applicants' claim 1, an AutoREC signal is multiplexed with a recorded video signal. Thus, Shimada does not include all of the features of claim 1. Accordingly, allowance of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-6 include all of the features of claim 1 from which they depend. In addition, Shimada does not disclose or suggest that information on a start point and an end point with a same value are repeated throughout a plurality of frames where the recording is continued, as recited by claims 5 and 6. Accordingly, claims 2-6 are also patentable over the cited art.

Amended claim 8, although not identical to claim 1, includes features similar to claim 1 which are neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited art. Namely, recording a generated video signal where a video signal with which a generated AutoREC signal has been multiplexed is recorded. As discussed above, these features are neither disclosed nor suggested by Shimada. Accordingly, allowance of claim 8 is respectfully requested.

Claims 9-23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimada in view of Murata et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,260,306). These claims, however, are patentable over the cited art for the reasons set forth below.

Claims 9 and 10 include all of the features of claim 8 from which they depend. Murata et al. do not make up for the deficiencies of Shimada because they do not disclose or suggest recording a generated video signal where a video signal with which a generated AutoREC signal has been multiplexed is recorded. Accordingly, claims 9 and 10 are also patentable over the cited art for at least the same reasons as claim 8.

Claim 11, as amended, include features neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited art, namely:

... video signal reproduction means of reproducing a recorded video signal that has been generated, with which an AutoREC signal is multiplexed, said AutoREC signal having been generated in conjunction with a start and/or a stop of a performed recording based on respective indications of the start and/or the stop of said recording and having recording marks multiplexed with frames where said recording is continued ...

... AutoREC signal detection means of detecting said AutoREC signal which is multiplexed with said reproduced video signal ...

Claims 20 and 23 include similar recitation. Basis for the amendment to claims 11, 20 and 23 can be found, for example, at page 15, line 13 - page 16, line 4; page 16, line 14 - page 17, line 13, and Figs. 1-3.

Shimada is described above. As discussed above, Shimada not disclose or suggest that an AutoREC signal is multiplexed with a recorded video signal. Accordingly, Shimada cannot disclose or suggest Applicants' claimed features of 1) "reproducing a recorded video signal that has been generated, with which an AutoREC signal is multiplexed," where "said AutoREC signal having been generated in conjunction with a start and/or a stop of a performed recording based on respective indications of the start and/or the stop of said recording and having recording marks multiplexed with frames where said recording is continued" or 2) "AutoREC signal detection means of detecting said AutoREC signal which is multiplexed with said

reproduced video signal" (emphasis added). These features are neither disclosed nor suggested by Shimada. Thus, Shimada does not include all of the features of claim 11.

Murata et al. disclose, in Fig. 10, operations of an editing method for performing role editing work where all of the flow operation shown in Fig. 10 are "executed by manually operating the control apparatus 54 while an editor observes the images reproduced on the monitor 52 (col. 2, lines 14-21). Murata et al. do not make up for the deficiencies of Shimada because they do not disclose or suggest 1) reproducing a recorded video signal that has been generated with which an AutoREC signal is multiplexed, where the AutoREC signal is generated in conjunction with a start and/or a stop of a performed recording and having recording marks multiplexed with frames where the recording is continued or 2) AutoREC signal detection means of detecting the AutoREC signal which is multiplexed with a reproduced video signal. These features are neither disclosed nor suggested by Murata et al. Thus, neither Shimada, Murata et al. nor their combination disclose all of the features of claim 11. Accordingly, allowance of claim 11 is respectfully requested.

Claims 12-18 include all of the features of claim 11 from which they depend. Accordingly, these claims are also patentable over the cited art.

Amended claim 20, although not identical to claim 11, includes features similar to claim 11 which are neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited art. Namely, 1) reproducing a recorded video signal that has been generated with which an AutoREC signal is multiplexed, where the AutoREC signal is generated in conjunction with a start and/or a stop of a performed recording and has recording marks multiplexed with frames where the recording is continued and 2) detecting the AutoREC signal which is

multiplexed with the reproduced video signal. As discussed above, these features are neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, allowance of claim 20 is respectfully requested.

Claims 21 and 22 include all of the features of claim 20 from which they depend. Accordingly, these claims are also patentable over the cited art.

Amended claim 23, although not identical to claims 1 and 11, includes features similar to these claims which are neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited art. Namely, 1) video signal recording means of recording a generated video signal where the video signal recording means records a video signal with which the generated AutoREC signal has been multiplexed, 2) video signal reproduction means of reproducing the recorded video signal with which the generated AutoREC signal is multiplexed and 3) detection means of detecting the AutoREC signal which is multiplexed with the reproduced video signal. As discussed above, these features are neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, allowance of claim 23 is respectfully requested.

Application No.: 10/511,831  
Amendment Dated: January 7, 2008  
Reply to Office Action of: October 5, 2007

MTS-3542US

In view of the amendments and arguments set forth above, the above-identified application is in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

RatnerPrestia



---

Allan Ratner, Reg. No. 19,717  
Attorney for Applicants

DMG/nm/fp

Dated: January 7, 2008

P.O. Box 980  
Valley Forge, PA 19482  
(610) 407-0700

205324